FILED
APR 4 192
WM. R. STANS
CL

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1923.

No. 32.

WILLIAM R. WARNER & COMPANY, *Petitioner*

vs.

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, *Respondent.*

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT.

E. W. BRADFORD,
Counsel for Plaintiff.

Washington, D. C.,
April 4, 1924.

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBJECT INDEX.

	Page
Statement	1
All Matters in Issue before this Court	2
The Issues	2
Defendant's Call for Help	5
Argument:	
Facts Proved by the Evidence	11
Evidence Supporting Plaintiff's Contentions:	
(a) Tasteless Liquid Quinine Preparation Original with Plaintiff.	11
(b) Coco-Quinine as Original Preparation Developed in Plaintiff's Laboratories	13
(c) Chocolate Non-Essential to Therapeutic Value of Preparation	13
(d) Chocolate Original with Plaintiff as Coloring and Flavoring Medium for Pharmaceuticals	17
Identifying means in Preparation Itself, Necessary (19).	
(e) Other Substances Available for Use of Defendant as a Coloring and Flavoring Medium for Its Product	21
Bibbins Experiments	23
(f) Defendant's Efforts to Reproduce Plaintiff's Product in Physical Appearance as well as in Medicinal Virtue	30
William S. Garvin	32
Groves-Fritsch Testimony	34
(g) Defendant's Methods	41
Sales of Quin-Coco	56
Witness Kelton	57
How Plaintiff Created the Demand (Detail Work) (58).	
Defendant Never Created a Market for Quin-Coco (Did not do Detail Work)	61
(h) Some Instances of Actual Substitution Shown by the Proofs.	67
(i) Defendant's Product Inferior	72
(j) Defendant Responsible for Its Sales Policy and Practices	74
Defendant's Officials Responsible	82
Debauchery of the Trade	89
(k) The Name "Coco-Quinine" Identifies Plaintiff's Product and Represents Plaintiff's Good-Will	91
(l) Passing Off by Defendant's Methods is Fraud	99
(m) Similarity of Trade Names and Likelihood of Confusion	100
"Inherent Improbability"	101
Defendant's Other Substitutes	104
Plaintiff's Exhibit "Document No. 3"—the "Blue List"	106
Ethics—Plaintiff's Standards	112
General Line or Open Formula Preparations	116
Road to Fair Competition Open and Free	118
Other Imitations	118
Difficult to Duplicate	119
How Did Defendant Succeed?	121

Page

Quin-Coco not Distinguishable from Coco-Quinine 122
Beringer's Blunder 123
Medicine—Not a Food 127
"Substitute"—Significance of 128
"Crime" of Substitution 131
Substitution Unethical and Dishonest 133
Comparative Value of Testimony 137
"Salesmen's Confidential" 141
Laches 145
Plaintiff's Rights 151
Authorities 152
Defendant's Position 173
Errors in Petitioner's Brief 180
Plaintiff Sought no Monopoly 181
Court of Appeals Decision has been Approvingly Cited by Other Courts 184
Conclusion 192

Appended hereto are photolithographic copies of three of plaintiff's documentary exhibits as follows:

"Document No. 1"—a copy of a part of the page in Mr. Eberhardt's journal showing his original record in his own handwriting of the result of his efforts in devising the formula for the medicine "Coco-Quinine."

"Document No. 3" (page 1) being the document referred to throughout the record and brief as defendant's "Blue List."

"Perfume Card A," being a copy of the card with its front and rear faces shown side by side, used by some of defendant's salesmen in selling perfumes.

"Perfume Card B," being a later edition of the card similar to Card A.

TABLE OF CASES.

Page

Auto Acetylene Light Co. v. Prest-O-Lite Co., 264 Fed., 810..... 165
Badische Anilin, etc., v. Klipstein (C. C.), 125 Fed., 543, 556.. 166
Banzhaf v. Chase, 150 Cal., 180 (88 Pac., 704)..... 173
California Fig Syrup Co. v. Frederick Stearns Co., 73 Fed., 812. 154
Cheney Bros. v. Gimbel Bros., 280 Fed., 746..... 185
Chemical Co. v. Meyer, 139 U. S. 540, 11 Sup. Ct. 625..... 155
Chicago P. T. Co. v. Phila. P. T. Co. (C. C.), 118 Fed., 852..... 166
Cleveland Stone Co. v. Wallace (C. C.), 52 Fed., 431, 438..... 172
Coca-Cola v. Duberstein, et al. (D. C., S. D. Ohio, W. D., 1918), 249 Fed., 763 159
Coca-Cola Co. v. Gay-Ola Co., 200 Fed., 720, 119 C. C. A., 164, 89, 152, 156, 160, 161, 163, 165, 169
Coca-Cola v. Koke Co. of America, 254 U. S. 143..... 177
Computing Scale Co. v. Standard Computing Scale Co., 118 Fed., 967, 55 C. C. A., 459 162
Croft v. Day, 7 Beav. 84 155
Dennison Mfg. Co. v. Thomas Mfg. Co. (C. C.), 94 Fed., 651.... 168
A. B. Dick Co. v. Henry (C. C.), 149 Fed., 424..... 166
Elgin Nat. Watch Co. v. Illinois Watch Co., 179 U. S., 674, 21 Sup. Ct., 270, 45 L. Ed. 365 162
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Landers (C. C.), 124 Fed., 923..... 172
Fairbank Co. v. Bell Mfg. Co., 77 Fed., 869 (23 C. C. A., 554).... 168
Fairbank Co. v. Luckel, etc., Co. (C. C. A., 9), 102 Fed., 327 (42 C. C. A., 376) 165
Fairbanks Co. v. Windsor, et al. (C. C. A.), 124 Fed., 200 (61 C. C. A., 233) 167
Florence Mfg. Co. v. Dowd, et al. (C. C. A.), 189 Fed., 44 (110 C. C. A. 608) 163, 167
Fox v. Best Baking Co., 209 Mass., 251 (1911) 170
Gaines & Co. v. Turner-Looker Co. (6th Cir., 1913), 204 Fed., 553; 123 C. C. A., 79 .....165, 169, 176
Garrett v. Garrett (C. C. A. 6), 78 Fed., 472-476 (24 C. C. A., 173) 89, 153, 156
Garrett & Co. vs. A. Schmidt, Jr., & Bros. Wine Co., 256 Fed., p. 943 99
Globe Wernicke Co. v. Macey Co., 119 Fed., 696, 704, 56 C. C. A., 304 159
Gorham Mfg. Co. v. Schmit (D. C.), 196 Fed., 955..... 166
Gulden v. Chance, et al., 182 Fed., 303 (105 C. C. A., 16)..... 168
Heller and Merz Co. v. Shaver, et al. (C. C., N. D. Iowa, 1900), 102 Fed., 882 172
Helment Co. v. Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co., 245 Fed., 824, 830..... 163
Hennessy, et al., v. Wine Growers' Ass'n. (D. C., S. D., N. Y., 1914), 212 Fed., 308.....166, 176
Hilker Mop Co. v. U. S. Mop Co., 191 Fed., 613; 112 C. C. A., 176 . . . .158, 169

Page

Hiram Walker & Sons v. Grubman, et al., 222 Fed., 478, 479.....161
Hiram Walker & Sons v. Grubin, 224 Fed., 175 (N. Y.)..... 175
Holeproof Hosiery Co. v. Wallach Bros. (C. C. A. 2d), 172 Fed., 859 178
Holloway v. Holloway, 13 Beav. 209 155
Hostetter Co. v. Becker (C. C.), 73 Fed., 297..... 166
Hostetter Co. v. Brueggeman (C. C.), 46 Fed., 188..... 166
Hostetter Co. v. Conron (C. C.), 111 Fed., 737..... 166
Hostetter v. Fries, 17 Fed., 620 (N. Y.)..... 175
Hostetter Co. v. Schneider (C. C.), 107 Fed., 705..... 166
Hostetter Co. v. Sommers (C. C.), 85 Fed., 333..... 166
Julius Kessler & Co. v. Goldstrom, 177 Fed., 392 (101 C. C. A.), 476 166
Kalem Co. v. Harper Bros., 222 U. S. 55-63, 56 L. Ed. 92..... 156
Kawneer Mfg. Co. v. Detroit Show Case Co., 240 Fed., 757..... 163
Kellogg Toasted Corn Flake Co. v. Quaker Oats Co., 235 Fed., 657, 665 162
Knight v. Milner Co., 288 Fed., 816..... 185
Kronthal Waters, Ltd., v. Becker (C. C., E. D. Pa., 1905), 137 Fed., 649 172
Lawrence, et al., v. P. S. Sharpless Co. (Penna. 1913), 203 Fed., 762 168
Lawrence Mfg. Co. v. Tennessee Mfg. Co., 138 U. S., 537 (34 L. Ed., 997, 1004) 155, 172, 173
Lever v. Goodwin, L. R. Ch., Div. 1 168
Lever Bros., Ltd., v. Massbro' Equitable, etc., Soc., 29 Rep. Pat. Cas., 225, 234, 106 L. T., 472..... 173
McLean v. Fleming 96 U. S., 245 (24 L. Ed., 828)..... 155
Margaret Steiff, Inc., v. Bing, 215 Fed., 204, 207..... 161
Moxie Co. v. Doaust (1st Circuit), 1913, 206 Fed., 434; 124 C. C. A. 316 159
National Biscuit Co. v. Baker, et al. (C. C.), 95 Fed., 135..... 168
Notaseme, etc., Co. v. Straus (2d Cir., 1921), 201 Fed., 99; 119 C. C. A., 134 167
Putnam Nail Co. v. Bennett, et al. (C. C., E. D. Pa., 1890), 43 Fed., 800 . . . . . 171, 172
Rathbone Co. v. Champion Co., 189 Fed. (C. C. A. 6), 26, 33 (110 C. C. A., 596; 37 L. R. A. (N. S.), 258).....157, 158
Revere Rubber Co. v. Consolidated Hoof Pad Co. (C. C.), 139 Fed., 151 168
Rice & Co. v. Redlich Mfg. Co. (1913), 202 Fed., 155..... 175
Royal Co. v. Royal, 122 Fed., 337, 345 (58 C. C. A. 499)..... 156
Rubber, etc., Co. vs. Devoe, et al., 233 Fed., 150 (N. J., 1916).... 162
Rushmore v. Badger Brass Mfg. Co. (2nd Cir., 1912), 198 Fed., 379; 117 C. C. A., 255..... 172

Page

Rushmore v. Manhattan Screw & Stamping Works, 163 Fed., 939 (90 C. C. A., 299 L. R. A. (N. S.), 269) 172

Rushmore v. Saxon, 170 Fed., 1021 (95 C. C. A., 671) 172

Samson Cordage Works v. Puritan Cordage Mills, 211 Fed., 610, 128 C. C. A., 203, L. R. A., 1916, F., 1107 ..... 163, 169

Samuel & Co. v. Hostetter, 118 Fed., 257 (55 C. C. A., 111) 166

Scheuer v. Muller, et al. (C. C. A., 744 Fed., 225; 20 C. C. A., 161) 168

Scriven v. North, 134 Fed., 366 ..... 163, 172

Shredded Wheat Co. v. Humphrey Cornell Co., et al., 250 Fed., 960 164

Shredded Wheat Co. v. Humphrey Cornell Co., et al. (D. C., D. Conn., 1917), 244 Fed., 508, 522 172

Standard Varnish Works v. Fisher, Thorsen & Co. (C. C. Oregon, 1907), 153 Fed., 928 172

Tarrant & Co. v. Hoff (C. C. A.), 76 Fed., 959 (22 C. C. A., 644). 165

Thompson v. Montgomery, 41 Ch. Div. 35-50 155

Westinghouse Co. v. Wagner Co., 225 U. S., 604 (32 Sup. Ct., 691; 56 L. Ed., 1222) 159

Wolf Bros. & Co. v. Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. (8th Cir., 1913), 206 Fed., 611; 124 C. C. A., 409 ..... 167, 176

Wotherspoon v. Currie, L. R. 5, H. L. 508 155

Wunder Mfg. Co. vs. Block (C. C. A., 9th), 249 Fed., 748, 749 ... 179

Yale & Towne Mfg. Co. v. Alder, 154 Fed., 37 172

Yale and Towne Mfg. Co. v. Worcester Mfg. Co. (D. C., D. Mass., 1913), 205 Fed. 952 ..... 166, 176